

REMARKS

Claims 1-28, 30-38, and 40-47 are pending.

Claims 1-28, 30-38, and 40-47 stand rejected.

Claim Objections

Claims 30 and 31 have been corrected to depend from claim 28.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 11, 17-19, 22-28, 30-34, 37-38, 41-45 and 47 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Guerrero*-U.S. Patent No. 6,236,400 (referred to herein as “*Guerrero*”) in view of Bernhardt et al.-U.S. Patent No. 6,496,208 (referred to herein as “*Bernhardt*”). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Guerrero addresses a problem associated with the display of file hierarchies of file systems. Namely:

Computer operating systems store information in files on a storage medium that is accessible via a file system. A file system organizes the contents of a storage device such that a user can determine the contents of the storage device. To organize files, a file hierarchy is adopted by some operating systems' file systems. Existing operating systems are inefficient in the manner in which the file hierarchy is displayed for review. For example, existing operating systems continue to display information that is no longer relevant to the user. *Guerrero*, col. 1, lines 12-21.

Guerrero teaches that:

Embodiments of the invention provide a method and apparatus for controlling the display of hierarchical information. Hierarchical information is displayed efficiently such that information that is no longer needed is not displayed. There is no requirement that hierarchical levels through which the user has previously navigated be displayed. There is no need for the user to perform maintenance on the display to close expanded levels. Embodiments of the invention minimize the amount of display space that is wasted by prior art techniques. *Id.*, col. 3, lns. 38-47.

Bernhardt relates to a “method and apparatus for displaying and navigating data organized in the form of a graph structure (hierarchy or network).” *Bernhardt*, Abstract. *Bernhardt* further teaches that “[o]ne goal of the invention is to help a user to visualize the contents of the database once it has been classified by means of a classifier scheme such as the scheme disclosed in the above mentioned patent application to *Chaudhuri et al* [U.S. Patent No. 6,212,526] which is incorporated herein by reference.

Applicants respectfully submit that *Guerrero* in combination with *Bernhardt* fails to teach or suggest “multiple sub-node navigation bars stacked below the root node navigation bar, each sub-node navigation bar representing a sub-node from a selected level of the multiple hierarchy levels, wherein multiple sub-nodes represent database classifiers of database objects and a plurality sub-nodes in the multiple hierarchy levels represent the same database classifier representing the same database object.” Claim 1 (emphasis added).

Similarly, Applicants respectfully submit that *Guerrero* in combination with *Bernhardt* fails to teach or suggest:

Claim 11 (emphasis added):

wherein multiple database classifier labels represent database objects and a plurality of database classifier labels in multiple hierarchy branches are the same database classifier label representing the same database object. ;

Claim 18 (emphasis added):

a control interfaced with the database and the display, the control operable to generate a user interface for presentation on the display, the user interface having the root node and predetermined sub-nodes stacked from highest to lowest hierarchy levels, the user interface further operable to hide predetermined sub-nodes that are not relevant to the sub-node having the lowest hierarchy level, wherein multiple sub-nodes represent database classifiers of database objects and a plurality of sub-nodes in the multiple hierarchy levels are the same database classifier representing the same database object.

Claim 22 (emphasis added):

instructions stored on the storage medium, the instructions operable to command a computer to display selected nodes from first, second or third hierarchy levels, the instructions selecting for display the

nodes of the first and second hierarchy levels display only the nodes of the first and second hierarchy levels on a traversed path to the third hierarchy level, wherein multiple nodes represent database classifiers of database objects and a plurality nodes in the hierarchy levels represent the same database classifier representing the same database object.

Claim 28 (emphasis added):

wherein multiple descendant nodes represent database classifiers of database objects and a plurality of descendant nodes in the multiple hierarchy levels represent the same database classifier representing the same database object.

Claim 38 (emphasis added):

wherein multiple sibling nodes represent database classifiers of database objects and a plurality of sibling nodes in the hierarchy levels represent the same database classifier representing the same database object.

Claim 43 (emphasis added):

wherein multiple sibling nodes represent database classifiers of database objects and a plurality of sibling nodes in the hierarchy levels represent the same database classifier representing the same database object.

In light of the foregoing remarks, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of independent claims 1, 11, 18, 22, 28, 38, and 43. Applicant also respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of the dependent claims for at least the same reasons as the independent claims upon which each indirectly or directly depends.

Claims 5, 8-10, 15 and 46 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Guerrero* in view of *Bernhardt* and further in view of Chittu et al.-U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0107892 (hereinafter “*Chittu*”).

Claim 7 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Guerrero* in view of *Bernhardt* and further in view of Lindberg et al.-U.S. Patent No. 6,732,109 (hereinafter “*Lindberg*”).

Claims 3, 12-14, 20-21, 35-36 and 40 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Guerrero* in view of *Bernhardt* and further in view of Janes et al.-U.S. Patent No. 6,642,946 (hereinafter “*Janes*”).

Claim 16 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Guerrero* in view of *Bernhardt* and further in view of *Janes* as applied to Claim 12, and further in view of *Chittu*.

The rejection of claims 3, 5, 7, 8-10, 12-14, 15, 16, 20-21, 35-36, 40, and 46 are respectfully, collectively traversed. Applicants respectfully submit that dependent claims 3, 5, 7, 8-10, 12-14, 15, 16, 20-21, 35-36, 40, and 46 are allowable for at least the same reasons as the independent claim upon which each directly or indirectly depends.

CONCLUSION

In view of the amendments and remarks set forth herein, the application is believed to be in condition for allowance and a notice to that effect is solicited. Nonetheless, should any issues remain that might be subject to resolution through a telephonic interview, the examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as First Class Mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Amendment, COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on April 24, 2006.



Attorney for Applicant(s)

4-24-2006

Date of Signature

Respectfully submitted,



Kent B. Chambers
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 38,839